

1
2
3
4
5 HOOPES VINEYARD LLC, et al.,
6 Plaintiffs,
7 v.
8 COUNTY OF NAPA,
9 Defendant.

10 Case No. 24-cv-06256-CRB
11
12

**13 ORDER REGARDING DEADLINE
14 TO RESPOND TO FIRST
15 AMENDED COMPLAINT**

16 The County of Napa has moved for an extension of time to respond to Plaintiffs'
17 amended complaint, requesting a deadline of January 21, 2025. Mot. (dkt. 46). The
18 County also seeks leave to file an oversize opening brief in support of an anticipated
19 motion to dismiss. Id. Plaintiffs oppose the County's motion regarding an extension to
20 January 21, but they do not oppose the County's request to file an oversize brief. Opp.
21 (dkt. 47). As to the extension, Plaintiffs highlight that the County refused to grant an
22 extension to Lindsay Hoopes, the majority owner of Hoopes Vineyard, LLC, in parallel
23 state court litigation, even though Ms. Hoopes is pregnant with twins and is representing
24 herself (as an individual defendant). Id. at 2–4. Plaintiffs suggest that they would have
25 been amenable to a two-week extension, which would result in a deadline of January 2,
26 2025. Id. at 2.

27 The Guidelines for Professional Conduct of this District state that, after “a first
28 extension of time … any additional requests for extensions of time” must “balanc[e] the
need for prompt resolution of matters against (i) the consideration that should be extended
to an opponent’s professional and personal schedule, (ii) the opponent’s willingness to
grant reciprocal extensions, (iii) the time actually needed for the task, and (iv) whether it is

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 likely that the court would grant the extension if asked to do so.” This case involves
2 serious constitutional and statutory questions, and both parties have an interest in prompt
3 resolution—Plaintiffs so they can run their businesses, and the County so it can enforce its
4 regulations. To be sure, the Court recognizes counsel’s competing obligations, especially
5 given the upcoming holidays, and is further aware that this case is complex and will
6 require the parties to devote meaningful time and energy to it. The Court is also mindful,
7 however, that the difficult situation that Ms. Hoopes faces in state court is, at least in part,
8 due to the County’s unwillingness to stipulate to an extension of time in that litigation.

9 Weighing these competing priorities, the Court finds good cause under Federal Rule
10 of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) to grant an extension of time to **Friday, January 10, 2025** to
11 respond to Plaintiffs’ amended complaint. This is a reasonable extension. The Court also
12 grants the County’s request to file an oversize brief not exceeding 35 pages. And as an
13 administrative matter, any deadlines and hearings associated with the County’s motion to
14 dismiss Plaintiffs’ initial complaint are vacated.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: December 16, 2024



17 CHARLES R. BREYER
18 United States District Judge

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28